



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,979	08/31/2000	Adrian Shields	8490.00	3073
7590	09/07/2004			EXAMINER - PYZOWA, MICHAEL J
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/651,979	SHIELDS, ADRIAN	
	Examiner Michael Pyzocha	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 are pending.
2. The amendment of 5/21/2004 (paper no. 4) has been received and considered.

Drawings

3. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 5/21/2004. These drawings are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

4. In view of the amendment made to the paragraphs one pages 6 and 7, the objection to the specification made in the earlier Office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. In view of the amendment made to claim 1, the rejection made in the earlier Office action for a 112 1st is hereby withdrawn.
6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2137

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the challenge value" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 13-14, 16-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawan (U.S. 2002/0062284) and further in view of McNair (U.S. 5,278,905).

As per claim 1, Kawan discloses a display for displaying financial transaction options, an input for receiving financial

Art Unit: 2137

data for a financial transaction (see paragraph 28), and means for encrypting the financial data with a key (see paragraph 31).

Kawan fails to disclose means for generating a new key for the financial transaction, wherein the key is generated using one or more variable properties of the portable terminal.

However McNair discloses means for generating a new key for the financial transaction, wherein the key is generated using one or more variable properties of the portable terminal (see column 4 lines 28-40).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use McNair's method of key generation for the key used in Kawan's encrypting means.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect an attacker from recording an encrypted string and sending that for the attackers own service request (see column 4 lines 19-31).

As per claim 3, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses the one or more variable properties of the portable terminal include date and time settings (see column 4 lines 28-40).

As per claim 5, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses a display for displaying financial transaction options, an input for receiving financial data for a financial transaction (see Kawan paragraph 28), means for generating a new

Art Unit: 2137

key for the financial transaction, wherein the key is generated using one or more variable properties of the portable terminal (see McNair column 4 lines 28-40) and means for encrypting the financial data with a key (see Kawan paragraph 31).

As per claim 10, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses a self-service terminal a portable terminal to execute an encryption program (see Kawan paragraphs 29 and 31) which is operable to use one or more variable properties of the portable terminal for obtaining a sequence of values for generating a new key based on the sequence of values (see McNair column 4 lines 28-40), and the portable terminal encrypting information for a financial transaction with the new key, and the portable terminal wirelessly transmitting encrypted information to the self service terminal (see Kawan paragraphs 29 and 31).

As per claim 13, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses a user interface having display for displaying financial transaction options, an input for receiving financial data for a financial transaction (see Kawan paragraph 28), memory for storing an encryption program, a controller for executing the encryption program (see Kawan paragraph 31) to generate a new key for the financial transaction, wherein the key is generated using one or more variable properties of the portable terminal (see McNair column 4 lines 28-40), the

Art Unit: 2137

controller encrypting information for a financial transaction with the new key, and a communication port to wirelessly transmitting encrypted information to the self service terminal (see Kawan paragraphs 29 and 31).

As per claim 14, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses the portable terminal being a PDA and the encrypted information being transmitted to an ATM (see Kawan paragraph 29).

As per claim 16, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses the user interface is a keypad and the financial transaction data includes a personal identification number (see Kawan paragraph 31).

As per claim 17, the modified Kawan and McNair system discloses the personal identification number being biometric based (see Kawan paragraph 31).

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Kawan and McNair system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chaum (U.S. 4,539,870).

The modified Kawan and McNair system fails to disclose the key being generated when the transaction is executed.

However, Chaum discloses generating a new key when the transaction is executed (see column 12 lines 3-7).

Art Unit: 2137

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a key when the transaction is executed as described by Chaum in the modified Kawan and McNair system.

Motivation to do so would have been to for temporary keys (see Chaum column 12 lines 3-7).

12. Claims 4, 6-9, 11-12, 15, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over modified Kawan and McNair system as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Menezes et al, Handbook of Applied Cryptography, CRC Press, 1997 (herein after Menezes).

As per claim 4, the modified Kawan and McNair system fails to disclose generating a unique challenge that can be issued for each transaction.

However, Menezes discloses the use of a unique challenge for each transaction (see 10.3, 10.3.1 and 10.9 on page 397).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the unique challenge of Menezes in the modified system of Kawan and McNair.

Motivation to do so would have been to prove the identity between entities (see Menezes 10.3 pg. 397).

As per claim 6, which adds the further limitation of the unique challenge being based on the sequence of values. Menezes

Art Unit: 2137

discloses this in section 10.3 on page 397 where the entities prove the identity by the knowledge of a secret associated with each entity (the encryption key which is based on the sequence of values).

As per claim 7, which adds the further limitation of encrypting the new key and challenge using a public key (see Menezes section 10.3.3 pages 403-404).

As per claim 8, the modified Kawan, McNair and Menezes system discloses using one or more properties of the portable terminal to obtain a sequence of values, generating a new key based on the sequence of values (see McNair column 4 lines 28-40), generating a challenge value based on the sequence of values (see Menezes page 397 as applied in claim 6), encrypting the new key and challenge using a public key (see Menezes section 10.3.3 pages 403-404) and transmitting this encrypted message to the self-service terminal (see Kawan paragraphs 29 and 31).

As per claim 9, the modified Kawan, McNair and Menezes system discloses generating a new challenge value at the self-service terminal, encrypting the challenge using the new key, transmitting it to the portable terminal (see Menezes section 10.3.3 pages 403-404 being performed in the self-service terminal of Kawan), and awaiting the correct response to the

Art Unit: 2137

transmitted challenge value being transmitted by the portable terminal before accepting any subsequent transaction at the self-service terminal (this is inherent from the idea of the challenge used to authenticate an entity before communicating with that entity as described in Menezes).

As per claim 11, the modified Kawan, McNair, and Menezes system discloses using one or more properties of the portable terminal to obtain a sequence of values, generating a new key based on the sequence of values (see McNair column 4 lines 28-40), generating a challenge value based on the sequence of values (see Menezes page 397 as applied in claim 6), encrypting the new key and challenge using a public key (see Menezes section 10.3.3 pages 403-404) and transmitting this encrypted message to the self-service terminal (see Kawan paragraphs 29 and 31) transmitting a response to the message to the portable terminal (see Menezes section 10.3.3 pages 403-404 being performed in the self-service terminal of Kawan), and halting any further transmission unless the decrypted response includes the correct reply to the challenge value (this is inherent from the idea of the challenge used to authenticate an entity before communicating with that entity as described in Menezes).

Art Unit: 2137

13. Claims 12, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Kawan and McNair system as applied to claims 1, 13 above, and further in view of Menezes.

As per claim 12, the modified Kawan and McNair system fails to disclose the one or more variable properties includes data stored in a dynamic heap of a memory.

However, Menezes discloses this on page 172 for the content of the input/output buffers where a heap is defined as an area of memory used for dynamic memory allocation and buffer is defined as an area of memory used for storing messages, and the input and output are constantly changing making the buffer dynamic.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Menezes method for creating a key based on dynamic heap of a memory in the modified system of Kawan, McNair, and Menezes.

As per claim 18, the modified system of claim 12 discloses the one or more variable properties includes usage history stored in the memory (see Menezes page 172 (ii) #2.).

14. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Kawan and McNair system as applied to claim 5, 13 above, and further in view of Menezes.

As per claim 15, the modified Kawan and McNair system fails to disclose the use of a symmetric key.

However, Menezes discloses the use of a symmetric key (see section 1.5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a symmetric key from Menezes in the modified system of Kawan and McNair.

Motivation to do so would have been the keys for symmetric keys are relatively short (see Menezes page 31).

As per claim 19, the modified Kawan, McNair and Menezes system discloses using a public key issued by a host for encryption (see Menezes section 1.8).

15. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Kawan, McNair and Menezes system as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Matyas et al (U.S. 4,941,176).

The modified system of Kawan, McNair and Menezes fails to disclose splitting a hash value into halves and encrypting the second half with the first half to produce a key.

However Matyas et al discloses such a method (see column 113 lines 15-44).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Matyas et al's

Art Unit: 2137

method for key generation in the modified system of Kawan, McNair and Menezes.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect against key half replicating attacks as described in column 113 lines 15-44 of Matyas el at.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments for claims 1-11 are removed based on amendments and the application of new prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 5:00pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

Andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell